



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,069	12/29/2000	Ravindra R. Mantena	YOR920000555US1	9009

7590 12/20/2005

WAYNE F. REINKE, Esq.
HESLIN & ROTHENBERG, P.C.
5 CLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203-5160

EXAMINER

LIPMAN, JACOB

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,069

Applicant(s)

MANTENA ET AL

Examiner

Jacob Lipman

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-112 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-112 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 14-17, 22-27, 29-35, 38, 39, 42-45, 50-55, 57-63, 66, 67, 70-73, 78-83, 85-91, 94, 95, 98-101, and 106-111, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by ERPNet, as disclosed in applicant's IDS as Dialog File 20, accession No. 02821200.

With regard to claims 1, 29, 57, and 85, ERPNet discloses a method for communicating between public (front-end) and private environments (back-end) (paragraph 6, beginning "using") including routing information from the public to the private environment (paragraph 7), obtaining a reply within the private environment, and returning the reply to the public environment (paragraph 8) in real time (paragraph 9).

With regard to claims 2, 30, 58, and 86 ERPNet discloses the back end is an ERP (SAP R/3).

With regard to claims 3-5, 31-33, 59-61, and 87-89, ERPNet discloses using middleware to communicate messages (MQSeries or MSMQ).

With regard to claims 6, 7, 10, 15, 16, 23, 34, 35, 38, 43, 44, 51, 62, 63, 66, 71, 72, 79, 90, 91, 94, 99, 100, and 107, ERPNet discloses that the front end can include a browser over the Internet (paragraph 6).

With regard to claims 11, 39, 67, and 95, ERPNet discloses tracking the communication (paragraph 9).

With regard to claims 14, 17, 42, 45, 70, 73, 98, and 101, ERPNet discloses sending the communication across a firewall (paragraph 14).

With regard to claims 22, 50, 78, and 106, ERPNet discloses sending the communication over a private network (VPN, paragraph 6).

With regard to claims 24-27, 52-55, 80-83, and 108-111, ERPNet discloses using SAP as the EPR and either MQSeries or MSMQ as the middleware (paragraph 6).

3. Claims 1, 29, 57, and 85, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gralla, in How The Internet Works.

With regard to claims 1, 29, 57, and 85, Gralla discloses communications between a public environment (internet) to a private environment (shopping site, bank), routing communication from the user in the public environment to the private environment (page 263 step 4) causing a reply to be produced in real time (step 5) and returning the reply to the user (step 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2134

5. Claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 18-21, 28, 36, 37, 40, 41, 46-49, 56, 64, 65, 68, 69, 74-77, 84, 92, 93, 96, 97, 102-105, and 112, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ERPNet.

With regard to claims 8, 9, 12, 13, 18-21, 36, 37, 40, 41, 46-49, 64, 65, 68, 69, 74-77, 92, 93, 96, 97, and 102-105, ERPNet discloses sending the information over the Internet as outlined above. ERPNet does not disclose encrypting the information. The examiner takes official notice that information sent over the Internet is frequently encrypted using SSL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to encrypt the data sent through ERPNet with SSL to improve security.

With regard to claims 28, 56, 84, and 112, ERPNet discloses using SAP as the ERP, but does not specifically mention BAAN. The examiner takes official notice that BAAN is a known ERP. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to communicate with a BAAN ERP using ERPNet's disclosed method for the disclosed motivation, "to reduce the time and effort required to conduct global industrial-strength business-to-business ERP transactions" (paragraph 2).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 28 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. With regard to applicant's argument that ERPNet does not occur in "real time" the examiner points to the first paragraph on the second page of the ERPNet disclosure starting "ERPNet enables". ERPNet discloses that users can monitor the flow and speed of the order. Further the term "real time" has not been defined by the

specification to limit the length of time of the transaction, thus all transactions must occur in real time.

8. With regard to applicant's argument that Gralla does not route communication from the user to a private environment, the examiner points out that the user presses submit, which sends the information over the Internet to the credit card company. Applicant argues that the reply from the credit card company is not a reply to the user. The examiner maintains that the user's submitted form is a request for a credit check, but also points out that the transaction server itself is a user in a public environment. Applicant further argues that the reply from the credit card company is never returned on the Internet. The examiner points again to step 6, where Gralla discloses the site confirms the order, which is also a display of the credit approval. In short, a user on the Internet types in his credit card number, thus requesting it be verified. The request is routed to the credit card company, and the result is displayed on the web site by confirming the order or denying the order.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2134

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Lipman whose telephone number is 571-272-3837. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7 AM-3 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 571-272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JL



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100